

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_98718
Title of the Manuscript:	Atypical location and appearance of chondromyxoid chondromyxoid fibroma in a child
Type of the Article	Case report

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajpr.com/index.php/AJPR/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. The manuscript seems clinically important area of concern. The study needs a literature survey of any such cases recorded previously and the MRI technology is adopted for the proper diagnosis. 2. Atypical location and appearance of chondromyxoid chondromyxoid fibroma (location of the tumour needs to be mentioned) in a child. 3. Yes, it seems comprehensive 4. The structure of the manuscript seems appropriate. Sub sections required some more studies in detail. 5. Yes, it is, But much better with some more studies with literature survey and any such cases that was prompted by MRI. 6. References seemed insufficient, as the validation by MRI, references would support the study more.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	1. Yes the communication seemed good.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article can be accepted for publication	

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sumana Kumar
Department, University & Country	JSS Academy of Higher Education & Research, India